

MINUTES
BOARD OF ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW
FRIDAY, JANUARY 25, 2002

Call to Order: The Board of Environmental Review's regularly scheduled meeting was called to order by Chairman Russell at 9:00 a.m. on Friday, January 25, 2002, in the Director's conference room, Metcalf Building, Room 111, 1520 East Sixth Avenue, Helena, Montana.

Attendance: Board members present at the meeting were: Joe Russell, Chairman, Kalispell; Susan Brooke, Bozeman; David Fishbaugh, Billings; Kim Lacey, Glasgow; Ward Shanahan, Helena; Garon Smith, Missoula (by telephone); and Russell Hudson, Kalispell (by telephone).

Also present were Kelly O'Sullivan and Thomas Bowe, Agency Legal Services, Attorney General's Office, Department of Justice, attorneys for the Board.

Laurie Crutcher, Registered Professional Court Reporter, Hendrickson Court Reporting, recorded the meeting and a transcript is available for the Board and interested parties on request to the Department.

DEQ Personnel: Jan Sensibaugh, Director; Curt Chisholm, Deputy Director; John North, Chief Counsel; Jim Madden, Department Attorney; Claudia Massman, Department Attorney; Mark Steger Smith, Department Attorney; John Arrigo, Administrator, Enforcement Division (ED); Frank Gessaman, Case Management Bureau (ED); Ed Coleman, Complaint Management Section, Case Management Bureau, (ED); Steve Welch, Division Administrator Permitting and Compliance Division (P&CD); Don Vidrine, Air and Waste Management Bureau (P&CD); Dave Klemp, Air & Waste Management Bureau (P&CD); Bonnie Lovelace, Bureau Chief, Water Protection Bureau (P&CD), Judy Hanson, Administrative Officer/Fiscal Officer (P&CD); Tom Reid, Water Quality Discharge Permit Section, Water Protection Bureau, (P&CD); Chuck Homer, Air and Waste Management Bureau (P&CD); Art Compton, Administrator, Planning, Prevention & Assistance Division (PP&AD); Debra Wolfe, Resource Protection Planning Bureau (PP&AD); Abe Horpestad, Resource Protection Planning Bureau, (PP&AD); Lisa Peterson, Public Affairs Coordinator; Sonja Cox, Board Secretary; and Elois Johnson, Paralegal, Director's Office.

Interested Persons: Stu Levit, American Wildlands; Anne Hedges, MEIC; Mary VanDenbosch, Legislative Environmental Policy Officer; Jeff Barber, MEIC; Joan Bowsher, L & C County; Laura Mullen, L & C County; Joan Miles, L & C County; M. S. Kakuk, MCA/WETA; Gail Abercrombie, Montana Petroleum Association; Will Selser, L & C Public Works; Don Allen, WETA; Charles Hansberry, Holland & Hart; Lisa Graham, Smurfit Stone; Steve Wade, Browning, Kaleczyc, Berry & Hoven; John Wilson, Montana Trout Unlimited; Nino Berube, CFAC; Steve Wright, CFAC; Ron Ament, CFAC; Cathy Laughner, Browning, Kaleczyc, Berry & Hoven, CFAC;

I. ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS:

A. Review and Approve Minutes of October 12, 2001, Teleconference Meeting

Chairman Russell called for approval of the October 12, 2001, teleconference meeting minutes. The Board held discussion and Chairman Russell stated that the court reporter's name was missing from the minutes.

Mr. Shanahan MOVED that the Board APPROVE the minutes of the October 12, 2001, teleconference meeting with the above change. Mr. Fishbaugh SECONDED the motion and the motion CARRIED unanimously.

B. Review and Approve Minutes of November 16, 2001, Meeting

Discussion was held and the Board identified changes that needed to be made to the minutes. The word "complied" was misspelled on page 4; the word should have been "complied." The minutes also did not reflect that Mr. Hudson was in attendance at the meeting and his attendance should be reflected.

Chairman Russell called for a motion to approved the minutes with the above changes.

Mr. Shanahan MOVED that the Board APPROVE the minutes of the November 16, 2001, meeting with the changes identified above. Dr. Smith SECONDED the motion and the motion CARRIED unanimously.

II. BRIEFING ITEMS:

A. Contested Case Update

1. Case Assigned to Hearing Officer, Kelly O'Sullivan

Town of Geraldine's Montana Pollutant Discharge Elimination Permit No. MT-002-0826

Ms. O'Sullivan updated the Board stating that the issues in the case are still in the process of being defined. She also indicated that the Town of Geraldine's expert was in Salt Lake City providing security for the Olympics and that she had granted a continuance in the matter until its expert returned. Ms. O'Sullivan has ordered the parties to meet on or before January 29th to discuss the issues and to try to move the case forward.

United Harvest Air Quality Permit No. 3126-00

Ms. O'Sullivan informed the Board that it had been dismissed as a party to this case by the District Court.

2. Appointment of Interim Hearing Officer

Chairman Russell informed the Board that Ms. O'Sullivan had submitted a letter asking the Board to appoint Tom Bowe as interim hearing examiner for future contested cases.

Ms. Brooke MOVED that the Board appoint Tom Bowe as interim hearing examiner for the Board. Mr. Fishbaugh SECONDED the motion and the motion CARRIED unanimously.

III. ACTION ITEMS:

A. Rule Repeal, Amendment and Adoption - Repeal, Amendment and/or Adoption of Final Rules

1. MPDES Fee Rule Modifications

Bonnie Lovelace presented testimony to the Board on behalf of the Department. She informed the Board that a clerical error had occurred in the proposal and that the Department had intended to raise a fee and inadvertently lowered it. The Department intends to leave the fee at the current level of \$1,000 instead of lowering it to \$750.

Board members held discussion and asked questions of Ms. Lovelace regarding the fees and FTEs in the program. Ms. Lovelace described to the Board the reason the increase in fees is necessary. Mr. Chisholm also spoke to the Board regarding the last compliance audit the Department was involved in and the fact that the Department received a deficiency based on the fact that it was not adjusting fees commensurate with costs and that this proposal is an effort in trying to comply with that deficiency. He indicated to the Board that the Department would be reviewing fees at a minimum of every two years once the budgets are set.

Discussion was also held pertaining to enforcement actions on delinquent payments. Mr. Madden spoke to the Board and indicated that the Department does have enforcement discretion to defer payment and that the Department "may" take an action on late payments. He informed the Board that the Department would review the reasons for late payment and make decisions based the facts.

Discussion was held pertaining to compliance issues in the field. Ms. Lovelace spoke to the Board indicating that the program does compliance monitoring but that compliance is one of the reasons for the proposed increase. She indicated that the Department needed more resources to assist with the monitoring.

Mr. Shanahan wanted it on the record that he sees that the role of the Board is to try to interpret what is going on in the Department and what the Department is doing, so that the people to which these rules are going to be applied have some sense that there's a reasonable process going on and that there is a reason for what the Department is doing.

Mr. Hudson asked Ms. Lovelace if the Department was trying to do anything about cost-savings, reducing costs and trying to offset what is being forced upon the public by other people.

Ms. Lovelace again spoke to the Board regarding budgets, increased costs to the Department, etc. She indicated to the Board that the Department does try to use EPA funding whenever possible, but that EPA has informed all states that they must get their own funding and that the EPA cannot fund all their programs. She stated that Montana chooses to fund the program through user fees, but that the program also uses grants from the federal government whenever possible.

Mr. Hudson asked Ms. Lovelace if the public is having to obtain permits from both EPA and DEQ.

Ms. Lovelace informed the Board that dischargers located on Indian Reservations are required to obtain both permits at this time. She discussed the fact that both EPA and DEQ assert jurisdiction over discharges on reservations, but that Montana tries to coordinate with EPA on each individual permit.

Ms. Lovelace informed the Board that the program was operating on a deficit at this time and that delay of adoption of the proposal would force the Department to lay off employees.

Ms. Brooke stated to the Board that she felt the Department should have gone to the Legislature four years ago and asked for an increase in fees, and should better inform persons, affected by fees, of pending increases.

Dr. Smith indicated that he felt it would be appropriate to include in the notice a statement that the Department conduct a biannual review of the fees. Tom Bowe informed the Board that the issue was either to approve or not approve the proposed rules, but that the Board could direct the Department to review its fees.

Mr. Shanahan MOVED to approve the proposed rules with the condition that the Department do a review of the rule process before the next legislative session so the legislature has the information at the time it makes appropriations.

Further discussion was held regarding limits on what can be charged for the amount of flow and whether the backlog of people operating on old permits is being caught up.

Chairman Russell brought the motion Mr. Shanahan made back on the floor with an amendment to adopt the findings of the presiding officer relating to the 311 and 521 analysis.

Ms. Brooke SECONDED the motion. Five members voted in SUPPORT of the motion and one member OPPOSED the motion. The Chairman noted the one vote in opposition. The motion CARRIED.

2. DEQ Circular WQB-7 (Numeric Water Quality Standards)

Mr. Bowe indicated to the Board that Katherine Orr was the presiding officer for the proceeding, but that she could not be present. He informed the Board that the hearing officer's report pointed out that there was no problem with House Bills 521 and 311.

Chairman Russell called for a motion to approve the rule amendments and adopt the hearing officer's report which includes the 521 and 311 analysis. Mr. Fishbaugh MOVED for the motion. Ms. Lacey SECONDED the motion and the motion CARRIED unanimously.

B. Initiation of Rulemaking and Appointment of Hearing Officer

1. Water Quality Administrative Penalty Rule Amendments

John Arrigo asked the Board to initiate rulemaking to amend the Water Quality Act administrative penalty rules and explained why the amendment is necessary.

Discussion was held regarding the penalty rules and whether or not it was the Department's intent to assess a penalty on every violation. Mr. Arrigo explained to the Board that it is not the Department's intention and that violations will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis to determine whether a penalty is appropriate.

Mr. Shanahan MOVED to initiate this rulemaking proceeding and to appoint Tom Bowe as hearing officer. Ms. Brooke SECONDED the motion.

Chairman Russell called for further discussion. Don Allen, representing Western Environmental Trade Association (WETA) informed the Board that the language "upon determining that a violation has occurred" had been discussed when the interest groups met with the Department and that they were comfortable with that language. The proposed rule contained the language "reason to believe" that a violation occurred. John Arrigo stated the Department could accept the alternate language recommended by WETA.

Chairman Russell called for a vote on the motion on the floor. The motion CARRIED unanimously.

2. Air Quality Permit Rules

Charles Homer, Air and Waste Management Bureau, explained to the Board the reason the Department wanted to initiate this rulemaking. He informed the Board that the Department had met with a work group for the past two years to formulate the rules in a more logical format and to make them more clear and concise. Mr. Homer then informed the Board that the Department had received a request that the Board hear or be present at the hearing for this proceeding. He requested that the Board make a motion to initiate rulemaking and appoint a hearing officer.

Discussion was held by the Board regarding nuisance laws.

Mr. Shanahan MOVED to authorize the publication of the rulemaking and to appoint Tom Bowe as hearing officer. Ms. Lacey SECONDED the motion and the motion CARRIED unanimously.

Chairman Russell solicited comments from persons attending the meeting pertaining to this rulemaking.

Charles Hansberry, representing the Clean Air Act Advisory Council (CAAAC), asked the Board to reconsider its motion. He stated that he felt a preamble or purpose should be included in the notice and that the members of the CAAAC had made that request when discussing the notice with the Department initially. He also expressed concerns that the issues of pre-permit construction and past compliance were dropped from the notice. He also indicated that CAAAC requested the Board hear this matter.

Discussion was held whether the rules could be changed after the hearing was held. Mr. Bowe informed the Board that the textbook solution to this issue is for interested parties to submit a petition for rulemaking on the different issues of the rule. Mr. Bowe explained to the Board that he felt the preamble or statement of purpose is unnecessary, but that it could be part of the rulemaking if the Board wanted to include it.

Ann Hedges, representing the Montana Environmental Information Center (MEIC), informed the Board that she had been involved in this process and felt the Board should proceed with this notice and deal with the issues identified by Mr. Hansberry separately.

Don Allen inquired as to whether the Board was rejecting conducting this hearing itself. Chairman Russell answered in the affirmative.

The Board reaffirmed its decision to CARRY the above motion and to publish the notice as submitted.

3. Incorporation by Reference of Federal Air Quality Rules

Charles Homer presented this matter to the Board.

Mr. Hudson commented to the Board members his concerns about what he feels are continuing errors in the administrative rules and his feeling that the Department is having to correct such errors. He stated that his comment probably did not require a response.

Chairman Russell called for a motion. Dr. Smith MOVED that the Department initiate this rulemaking and appoint Mr. Bowe as hearing officer. Mr. Shanahan SECONDED the motion and the motion CARRIED unanimously.

The Board then heard item IV (2.) pertaining to CFAC in order to allow those individuals to return to their homes because of the weather.

IV. OTHER AGENDA ITEMS:

2. Columbia Falls Aluminum Company (CFAC)

Steve Wright, environmental manager for CFAC, presented the Board with a handout and then explained the work CFAC has completed at the plant.

III. ACTION ITEMS (Continued)

C. Final Action on Appeals

1. Livingston Rebuild Center (LRC) Enforcement Action

Kelly O'Sullivan presented the status of this case to the Board indicating that a Consent Order has been signed. That Order states that LRC agrees that it has violated various sections of the law and that it will pay a penalty of \$16,400 within two years of the date of the Order. Ms. O'Sullivan recommended that the Board dismiss this action.

Ms. Brooke MOVED that the Board dismiss the enforcement action against LRC and to authorize the Chairman to sign the Order. Mr. Shanahan SECONDED the motion and the motion CARRIED unanimously.

D. New Contested Case Appeals

1. Conoco Inc. (Billings Refinery)

Mr. Shanahan MOVED to appoint Kelly O'Sullivan as hearing officer in this matter. Dr. Smith SECONDED the motion and the motion CARRIED unanimously.

Mr. Hudson inquired as to whether other regulated industries are facing the same problem that should be addressed along with this matter.

David Klemp, air permitting supervisor, informed the Board that the Department had issued approximately 70 Title V permits and that no other appeals had been received on this issue.

2. Blaine County Appeal of Opencut Mining Act

Ms. Brooke MOVED to appoint Kelly O'Sullivan as hearing officer in this matter. Ms. Lacey SECONDED the motion and the motion CARRIED unanimously.

3 and 4. M & W Investments, Inc. Appeals of Subdivision Decisions

Ms. O'Sullivan informed the Board that she, as interim hearing officer, combined these two appeals as they relate to the same subdivision.

The Board held discussion on whether it wanted to hearing this case. John North, Chief Counsel for the Department, informed the Board that there was no public request for the Board to hear this matter, there has been no request for an expedited hearing, nor does the Department see any significant issues regarding nondegradation. He indicated that, if the Board wanted to hear a case, this may not be the one to choose.

Ms. Lacey MOVED to appoint Mr. Bowe as hearing officer in this matter. Ms. Brooke SECONDED the motion and the motion CARRIED unanimously.

5. Louisiana-Pacific Corporation Appeal of Title V Air Quality Permit

Ms. O'Sullivan indicated that she had been acting as interim hearing officer in this matter and that she had received a request that the Board hear this case.

Mr. Hansberry, representing Louisiana-Pacific, informed the Board that the Missoula County Air Pollution Control Board would be intervening as a party in this matter. He told the Board that, based upon that decision, his client would like the Board to hear this matter. He inquired of the Board as to whether the Department could designate authority to a local air pollution control board as a designated representative of the Department to conduct visual surveys.

Dr. Smith inquired of Mr. Hansberry whether it was the Missoula City County Health Board or the Missoula City County Health Department that voted to intervene in this matter. Mr. Hansberry stated that the Health Department made a recommendation to the Board and that the Board voted to intervene. Dr. Smith recused himself from this matter.

Mr. Shanahan MOVED that the Board hear this matter and that Mr. Bowe schedule and do all of the prehearing motions for the Board for a hearing on June 6 or 7, 2002. Mr. Fishbaugh SECONDED the motion and the motion CARRIED with Dr. Smith abstaining.

E. Hearing and Action Items

1. Lewis and Clark County's Air Pollution Control Program

Chairman Russell read the public hearing notice statement into the record. Joan Miles, Health Officer in Lewis and Clark County, presented the County's proposed Ordinance to the Board.

Chairman Russell solicited comments in support and opposition to the proposed Ordinance. No comments were received.

Chairman Russell closed this public hearing at 12:25 p.m. and the Board went into Executive Session.

Dr. Smith stated that he felt the definition of particulate is ambiguously vague and that PM10 is addressed but not PM2.5 in the proposed Ordinance.

Mr. Hudson inquired of the Board attorney whether the changes the County made in its January 14, 2002 letter were substantive and whether he felt the public notice requirements were met by the County. Mr. Bowe explained to the Board which version of the ordinance would be approved.

Chairman Russell entertained a motion to accept the county air pollution control program of Lewis and Clark County, Appendix A, dated 1/14/02 and authorize the Chairman to execute the order by signature. Mr. Fishbaugh so MOVED. Mr. Shanahan SECONDED the motion and the motion CARRIED unanimously.

March Meeting Date:

The Board made the decision to keep the March 29 meeting date.

F. Other Action Items

3. MEPA Appeal Jurisdiction

Mr. Bowe advised the Board what changes were made to section 75-1-201 of the Montana Environmental Policy Act (MEPA) by the 2001 Legislature, dealing with final agency actions. Mr. Bowe stated the two differing interpretations of the law. Mr. Bowe informed the Board that it has the authority to request an attorney general opinion as to whether or not it has jurisdiction to hear MEPA issues in contested cases under the Air Quality Act. He explained the process of initiating the request and the process the request takes. He told the Board that it could issue its own interpretation of the law, but that the rule would be considered an interpretive rule and would need to be adopted under the Montana Administrative Procedure Act. Mr. Bowe informed the Board that his opinion was that the Board take the "wait and see" approach with this issue and deal with it when a contested case arises dealing with MEPA issues.

Dr. Smith excused himself from the meeting at this point.

Mr. North, Chief Counsel for the Department, spoke to the Board regarding his interpretation of the changes to section 75-1-201 of MEPA. Mr. North stated that, because the Department's action is not final until the Board acts on an appeal or there is no appeal, any MEPA appeal would not be ripe for adjudication at that point so could not be raised before the Board. Mr. North stated his opinion that, under the plain terms of the language and the legislative history, all MEPA appeals must go to District Court as opposed to being brought as a contested case.

1. Outstanding Resource Water Petition

Mr. Compton, representing the Planning, Prevention and Assistance Division of the Department, explained to the Board the petition for rulemaking by American Wildlands and the statutes required in an outstanding resource water classification process. He explained to the Board that the issue before it at this meeting was to decide whether to accept or reject the petition and whether to direct the Department to prepare an EIS. Mr. Compton presented a "power point" presentation setting forth the process.

Rob Ament, Executive Director of the American Wildlands and Stu Levitt, staff for American Wildlands, spoke in support of the petition.

Mr. Allen raised questions regarding this matter to the Board for its consideration before making a final determination.

John Wilson, Conservation Director for Montana Trout Unlimited, spoke in support of designating the Gallatin River as an outstanding resource water.

Gail Abercrombie, Executive Director of the Montana Petroleum Association, set forth her concerns about who would pay for the EIS and what the projected cost would be.

Chairman Russell solicited Board discussion. Mr. Compton informed the Board that the statute specifically says that the petitioner does not have to pay for the EIS.

Mr. Shanahan MOVED that the Board accept the petition conditioned upon the Department reporting back with respect to the source of funds available to pay for the EIS, and that the Board defer a final action until the next meeting. Ms. Brooke SECONDED the motion just for purposes of discussion.

The Board held discussion on whether or not the Gallatin River should be reclassified and whose decision it would be to reclassify it.

Chairman Russell stated that, if a vote were taken on the motion, it would probably fail. He stated that it would be wise to defer the matter until the next meeting and requested that an EIS work plan be submitted for the Board's consideration.

Mr. Shanahan made a substitute motion to lay his previous motion on the table. Ms. Brooke SECONDED.

Chairman Russell stated that, at the next meeting, the Department should discuss development issues, storm water issues, septic systems, multiuser systems, and small public systems that preliminarily might not require a permit. Mr. Compton committed to providing at least determinations on these issues at the next meeting.

Mr. Chisholm explained to the Board that the Department's feeling is that the petitioner's want whatever the existing water quality is today, they don't want it degraded any more. The Department feels that petitioners have submitted sufficient evidence for the Board to accept the petition and allow the process to continue. The Board will, during the hearing process, be able to address the issues that were presented at this meeting and, at that time, have the EIS and other information. That information will allow the Board to make a more knowledgeable decision as to whether it wants to initiate rulemaking proceedings to designate the Gallatin River as an outstanding resource water. He told the Board that one of its options was to defer the decision to accept or reject on initial review until the next meeting.

Further discussion was held as to whether or not the Board should defer a decision on this matter until its next meeting.

Mr. Shanahan restated his motion. Chairman Russell noted that Mr. Shanahan's motion had been seconded by Ms. Brooke. Chairman Russell asked for a vote on the motion of tabling Mr. Shanahan's motion. The motion CARRIED with Ms. Brooke voting in opposition.

2. Air Quality Permit Appeal Process Modifications

Mr. Homer spoke to the Board regarding the letters it received from the AFL-CIO and WETA describing their concerns with the air permit appeal process. He informed the Board that a meeting was held on January 9 with representatives of the parties that had requested a change in the appeal process. He indicated that a summary of that meeting was in the Board's packets. Mr. Homer reviewed the main points of that meeting. Mr. Homer indicated that it is the Department's belief that rulemaking would be required to establish the specific deadlines, disclosure statements, etc., in any new appeal process.

Mr. Allen, representing WETA, and Don Quander spoke in support of amending the appeal process to make it, in their opinion, more efficient.

Ms. Hedges, representing MEIC, offered the opinion that the process is working and does not need to be changed. She did offer that, if the appeal process is changed, it is her belief that rulemaking would be required. Ms. Hedges also offered six other areas she felt needed clarification: 1) what constitutes an affidavit; 2) allowing permittees to be a party to the appeal without any kind of special intervention; 3) the Board should participate in setting time frames for the appeal on a case-by-case basis; 4) the Board would decide on a case-by-case basis whether it wants to hear an appeal directly; 5) the appeal has to state the requested relief, but that is not binding; and 6) clarify the MEPA question regarding Board authority and when the time clock starts ticking for the applicant to go to court. Ms. Hedges identified MEIC's concerns with WETA's proposal. She urged the Board to set aside WETA's petition and if the Board decides to proceed with rulemaking, do it on a limited basis.

Jan Sensibaugh, Director for the Department of Environmental Quality, presented the Department's position on this issue. She indicated to the Board that the Department believes that everyone involved in an appeal deserves a timely resolution, but that the process would not be served by shortening the time frame to the detriment of the decision. Ms. Sensibaugh indicated the Department's belief that the Board should, on a case-by-case basis and with input by the parties, determine the date by which they will make a decision. The Department believes that an administrative process for review of the Department's decision is important for the public and the permit applicants and does not want to eliminate or limit the administrative process.

Discussion was held between Mr. Shanahan and Mr. Quander regarding the public's ability to enter into an appeal of a final decision.

Ms. Lacey left the meeting at this point.

Chairman Russell addressed the Board stating it is his belief that every case has merit in and of itself and that, if the Board continues to be diligent in trying to expedite the cases, WETA's concerns will be answered. It was his recommendation that the Board do nothing with this item at this time.

Mr. Shanahan MOVED to adopt the guideline that the applicant is considered a party to a proceeding unless applicant opts out. Mr. Bowe indicated to the Board his opinion that the Board can proceed with this motion. Ms. Brooke SECONDED the motion and the motion CARRIED unanimously.

Chairman Russell stated his belief that the Board has been in support of moving these processes rapidly, but that there may be some that are going to take more time. He indicated that the Board would continue to look at affidavits as they should be and, with the help of Board counsel, will set expedited schedules. He stated that he felt the Board should take no further action on this issue.

Mr. Shanahan volunteered to work with Mr. Bowe on developing a proposed guideline regarding scope of appeal and confining discovery to that scope of appeal.

Mr. Fishbaugh inquired as to whether the appeal is 15 days after determination. Chairman Russell stated that the appellant has 15 days in which to file an affidavit stating their reasons why the permit should be denied.

V. ADJOURNMENT

Chairman Russell asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting.

Ms. Brooke MOVED to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Fishbaugh SECONDED the motion and the motion CARRIED.

The meeting of the Board was adjourned at 3:50 p.m.

Board of Environmental Review Minutes Approved:

JAN P. SENSIBAUGH, DIRECTOR

DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL

QUALITY

JOSEPH W. RUSSELL, M.P.H.

CHAIRMAN

BOARD OF ENVIRONMENTAL

REVIEW

DATE